DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 271 434 SP 027 738

AUTHOR Davis, William J.; Frank, Frederick
TITLE The Relationship between the Perceived Level of Decisional Participation of Secondary School Teachers and Their Job Satisfaction: A Discrepancy Approach. Working Paper No. 272.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Research and Development Center for Individualized Schooling.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Nov 79
GRANT OB-NIE-G-78-0217
NOTE 65p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Innovation; *Job Satisfaction; *Participative Decision Making; Secondary Education; *Secondary School Teachers; *Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

The Studies of Implementation project is a 3-year longitudinal investigation of planned educational change. The research focuses on the process by which an innovation becomes a pattern of individualized schooling. This study identifies those conditions that promote or retard change and relates them to the modifications they foster. It reports on the results of a study of the relationship between the perceived level of participation and the level of job satisfaction of secondary school teachers. The study: (1) tested the Alutto-Belasco argument that an individuals' desire for increased participation mediates this relationship; (2) tested the validity of the commonly used "summated" scoring procedure for measuring decisional participation; and (3) investigated the utility of defining decisional participation in terms of frequency and extent of involvement. The study follows the direction set by Alutto and Belasco (1972), but extends their work by assessing the practicality of considering decisional participation as bidimensional, consisting of the frequency (rate) and extent (quality) of subordinate involvement. (Author/JD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED271434

Working Paper No. 272

# The Relationship Between the Perceived Level of Decisional Participation of Secondary School Teachers and Their Job Satisfaction: A Discrepancy Approach

by William J. Davis and Frederick Frank

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 027 738

November 1979

Wisconsin Research and Development
Center for Individualized Schooling

Working Paper No. 272

# THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PERCEIVED LEVEL OF DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS AND THEIR JOB SATISFACTION: A DISCREPANCY APPROACH

by

William J. Davis
Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Individualized Schooling

Frederick Frank
Northern Illinois University

Report from the Project on
Studies of Implementation of Individualized Schooling

Marvin J. Fruth
Faculty Associate

Wisconsin Research and Development Center
for Individualized Schooling
The University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

November 1979

Published by the Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Individualized Schooling. The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

Center Grant No. OB-NIE-G-78-0217

# MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Wisconsin Research and Development Center is to improve the quality of education by addressing the full range of issues and problems related to individualized schooling. Teaching, learning, and the problems of individualization are given concurrent attention in the Center's efforts to discover processes and develop strategies and materials for use in the schools. The Center pursues its mission by

- conducting and synthesizing research to clarify the processes of school-age children's learning and development
- conducting and synthesizing research to clarify effective approaches to teaching students basic skills and concepts
- developing and demonstrating improved instructional strategies, processes, and materials for students, teachers, and school administrators
- providing assistance to educators which helps transfer the outcomes of research and development to improved practice in local schools and teacher education institutions

The Wisconsin Research and Development Center is supported with funds from the National Institute of Education and the University of Wisconsin.

WISCONSIN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
CENTER FOR INDIVIDUALIZED SCHOOLING

Acknowledgments

This paper was in process at the time of Dr. Davis' death. The Center wishes to thank Dr. Frederick Frank of Northern Illinois University for completing what he and Dr. Davis had begun together.

Table of Contents


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Acknowledgments | iv |
| List of Tables | vii |
| Abstract | ix |
| Background of the Study | 1 |
| Purposes of This Study | 11 |
| Procedures | 12 |
| The Sample | 12 |
| Job Satisfaction | 13 |
| Decisional Participation | 16 |
| Vroom Index of Psychological Participation (Influence) | 21 |
| Scoring Rules | 27 |
| Modified decision condition | 27 |
| Findings | 28 |
| Importance of the 11 Decisional Issues | 32 |
| Hypotheses | 35 |
| Results | 44 |
| Discussion | 47 |
| References | 53 |

List of Tables


| Table | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Relevant Findings from the Mohrman et al. Study: Partial Correlations Between Organizational Outcome Variables and the Actual Participation Approach and Discrepancy Approach | 8 |
| 2 | Description of Respondents. | 14 |
| 3 | Internal Consistency of the Job Satisfaction Scale: Inter-item Correlations | 17 |
| 4 | Frequency Distribution of Job Satisfaction Scores. | 18 |
| 5 | Frequency Distribution of Responses to the Job Satisfaction Scale, Item by Item. | 19 |
| 6 | Internal Consistency of the Vroom Index: Inter-item and Total Score Correlations | 24 |
| 7 | Frequency Distribution of Responses to the Vroom Index, by Item. | 25 |
| 8 | Frequency Distribution of Responses to the Vroom Index, Total Scale. | 26 |
| 9 | Perceived Degree of Actual and Desired Frequencies of Participation, by Decisional Area | 29 |
| 10 | Frequency Distribution of Modified Decisional Conditions Scores. | 30 |
| 11 | Distribution of Scores within the Alutto-Belasco Typology: Modified Decisional Condition Scoring Procedure | 31 |
| 12 | Relative "Importance" of Decisional Issues: Means and Standard Deviations | 33 |

List of Tables
(continued)


| Table | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 13 | Frequency Distribution of Responses to the Importance of the Decisional Issues . . . . . | 34 |
| 14 | The Identification of "Most Important" Issues . . . . . | 36 |

Abstract

The Studies of Implementation project is a 3-year longitudinal investigation of planned educational change. Specifically, the research focuses on the process by which an innovation becomes a pattern of individualized schooling. This study identifies those conditions that promote or retard change and relates them to the modifications they foster.

Five potentially significant factors were identified by the research staff after a review of the change literature. Two of these variables are dealt with directly--job satisfaction and participation in the decision-making process.

This working paper reports the results of a study of the relationship between the perceived level of participation and level of job satisfaction of secondary school teachers. The study provided an opportunity to pilot the decisional participation questionnaire which has since been adapted for use in the Studies of Implementation project. The study also allowed for a beginning exploration of the relationship between two potential key variables in the change process.

In investigating the relationship between decisional participation and job satisfaction among secondary school teachers, this study: (a) tested the Alutto-Belasco argument that an individual's

desire for increased participation mediates this relationship; (b) tested the validity of the commonly used "summated" scoring procedure for measuring decisional participation; and (c) investigated the utility of defining decisional participation in terms of the frequency and extent of involvement. This study follows the direction set by Alutto and Belasco but extends their work by assessing the practicality of considering decisional participation as bidimensional, consisting of the frequency (rate) and extent (quality) of subordinate involvement.

## Background of the Study

It is generally acknowledged in practice and theory that the meaningful participation of subordinates in organizational decision making yields substantial benefits to the individual and the organization. A number of studies have linked increased decisional participation to such organizationally valued outcomes as increased job satisfaction and productivity and decreased absenteeism, turnover, and resistance to change. On the other hand, however, other studies do not support such positive relationships.

Most scholars do not interpret these inconsistent early findings as refuting the basic decisional participation hypothesis but rather have criticized the research methods used or have called attention to inconsistencies in defining basic terms. Further research has resulted in more complex concepts. These more recent theorists hypothesize that the effect of participation is predominantly situational, depending on mediating factors such as subordinate personality type, the leadership style, and the nature of the decisional issues or areas being addressed. With regard to these theories, the argument of Alutto and Belasco (1972) has captured a good deal of attention. They write:

> Researchers too often maintain that the desire for increased participation is equally and widely distributed

> throughout an organization. . . . It is more reasonable to assume that not all segments of the population are equally desirous of additional participation in organizational life. If this is correct, then the crucial variable is the discrepancy between current and desired rates of participation rather than a system member's absolute rate of participation.

Alutto and Belasco demonstrated that the desire for increased decisional participation is by no means uniformly distributed, at least throughout the teacher population they sampled. In fact, they found some teachers who desired even less participation than they currently possessed. These findings substantiated a hypothetical typology for decisional participation in which members of an organization were categorized as decisionally deprived (participating less than desired), decisionally saturated (participating more than desired), or in decisional equilibrium (participating as much as desired). Further, Alutto and Belasco substantiated the validity of their typology by showing that the three groups also differed by age, sex, teaching level, employing organization, seniority, perceptions of administrative influence, perceptions of role conflict, and attitudinal militancy.

However, the central issue of the Alutto-Belasco argument remains at least partially untested and unclear. It is not clear whether

the same or even greater levels of difference would have been observed had the criterion variable been the absolute rate of participation, rather than the discrepancy measure. Thus the utility of the discrepancy concept still remains to be assessed.

Also, the final recommendation made by Alutto and Belasco (1972) for future research is noteworthy:

> While this article has concentrated primarily on rates of decisional participation, the quality of that participation has not been systematically examined. Participation can range from mere consultation to absolute control over final decisions . . . future research efforts might profitably focus on the relative impact of differing measures of participation in organization decision making, namely, concentration on type of participation in conjunction with overall rates of participation.

The purpose of the present study, then, was to test the key assumptions in the Alutto-Belasco argument. We questioned whether there is a relationship between the level of participation by subordinates in organizational decision making and their level of job satisfaction, a commonly sought organizational outcome. Our study follows the direction set by Alutto and Belasco by investigating whether this relationship is mediated by the degree to which subordinates desire decisional participation. We extend previous

work in the area by assessing the practicality of considering decisional participation as bidimensional, consisting of the frequency (rate) and extent (quality) of subordinate involvement.

In addition to the original work conducted by Alutto and Belasco, at least three studies dealing specifically with the Alutto-Belasco concept of participation have been reported. As dictated by their thesis, each study investigated the discrepancy between desired and actual levels of decisional participation. The studies represented simple variations of the same methodological paradigm. In each of the studies teacher respondents were presented with a list of decisional issues and were asked to rate each issue in terms of their actual and desired levels (frequency) of decisional involvement. The same basic set of approximately 11 decisional issues was used throughout. A discrepancy score was then computed for each respondent on each issue by subtracting the weights associated with their desired and actual levels of participation. The critical research variable was then derived by summing the scores for the entire set of issues.

While methodologically similar, these studies differed substantially in terms of their primary orientations. Best (1973) found a significant correlation of .355 between teacher morale, as assessed by the Purdue Opinionnaire, and the decisional discrepancy resume (a summated measure of the difference between actual and desired rates of participation). Conway (1976) tested

the linearity of the relationship between teachers' participation in decision making and their perceptions of their schools as organizations, using Likert's "Profile of a School." Among several other noteworthy findings, Conway found partial evidence that this relationship was curvilinear (more specifically, parabolic), and not linear as previously suspected. According to Conway, the peak of the curve between decisional deviation scores and perceptions of the organization occurred "where present and desired levels of participation are about equal. Both deprivation and saturation detract from the individual's satisfaction with the organization." And, finally, Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman (1978) investigated the importance of treating participation in decision making as multidimensional. They tried to determine whether different patterns of participation were systematically associated with different types of decisions, and whether this difference mediated the relationships between participation and several organizationally relevant variables. The major premise of Mohrman et al. was largely supported: decisional issues were identifiable as being either in the technical or managerial domains (in the Parsonian sense), and differential rates of participation were observed within these domains.

> In general, participation in the Technical Domain was found to be related to various effective responses of teachers to their job situation. Participation in

> Managerial Domain decisions, while correlated with participation in Technical Domain decisions, did not have a significant direct relationship with satisfaction or role stress scores (Mohrman et al., 1978).

Each of the four studies was at least partially successful in substantiating its primary hypotheses. However, further points are well worth noting. First, with the interesting exception of the Mohrman et al. study and for perhaps understandable reasons, no attempt was made to compare the results obtained through use of discrepancy measures to those that might be observed using a measure of absolute (actual or current) participation. Second, with the exception of the Best study, the discrepancy measures of decisional participation never explained as much as 10% of the variance in any of the several organizationally relevant outcome variables.

The main point of the Alutto-Belasco argument concerning the use of discrepancy measures is that the level at which subordinates desire to participate mediates the relationship between their actual level of decisional participation and organizationally desired outcomes. This notion, although admittedly persuasive, is only a supposition that demands empirical verification. Although each study could have tested its primary hypotheses using the perceived actual level of participation rather than the discrepancy measure, the results of such testing were only recorded in the instance of Mohrman et al.

Moreover, the results of the Mohrman et al. study cloud rather than clarify the Alutto-Belasco argument. As shown in Table 1 the Mohrman et al. study found that actual participation was usually as good as or better a predictor of the outcome variables than the discrepancy measure. Unfortunately, these findings must be viewed as only suggestive because there was slight divergence in the categorization of decisional issues under the actual participation and the discrepancy approaches.

Turning to the comparatively low level of predictive power found for the discrepancy measure, one may posit two seemingly plausible explanations: (a) the mutual acceptance of a restrictive definition of decisional participation, or (b) the difficulties in structuring a conceptually clear summed measure of decisional participation or discrepancy.

Although the problem of definition has hardly been resolved in the decision-making literature, most scholars view decisional participation as having more than one dimension. Alutto and Belasco, for example, suggest:

> Participation can range from the mere presentation of an opinion, where the locus of authority rests elsewhere, to membership in the group which exercises final authority over an issue. Given varying shades of participation, not all forms of participation will produce identical or

Table 1

Relevant Findings from the Mohrman et al. Study:[a] Partial Correlations Between Organizational Outcome Variables and the Actual Participation Approach and Discrepancy Approach

| Organizational outcome variable | Actual participation | | Discrepancy approach[b] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Technical domain | Managerial domain | Technical domain | Managerial domain |
| Extrinsic job satisfaction | .26* | .11 | .28* | .08 |
| Intrinsic job satisfaction | .27* | .08 | .16* | .10 |
| Role ambiguity | -.24* | .06 | -.14** | -.11 |
| Role overload | -.02 | -.03 | -.02 | -.10 |

[a]The Mohrman et al. study focused upon the utility of differentially assessing the relationship between organizational outcome variables and decisional participation dependent upon the domain in which the decision under consideration resides. For this reason there is a bifurcation of the partial correlations. Also of importance is the fact that there was some slight divergence between decisional issue categorization under the actual participation and the discrepancy approaches.

[b]Since discrepancy is equal to the actual score minus the desired score, a higher level of discrepancy is represented by a smaller number. Therefore, a positive correlation indicates that less deprivation is associated with a high level of the organizational outcome variable.

*$p < .001$.

**$p < .01$.

> even similar organizational outcomes. . . . While this article has concentrated primarily on rates of decisional participation, the quality of that participation has not been systematically examined.

Similar to the Alutto and Belasco study, the other three studies dealt with the frequency or rate of participation. This is most explicit in the Conway and Mohrman et al. study. For example, a typical item in the format used by Conway read as follows:

> When a new faculty member is hired in your school or department, would you be involved in making such a decision?
>
> Never . . . Sometimes . . . Often . . . Always
>
> Do you want to be involved in making such a decision?
>
> Never . . . Sometimes . . . Often . . . Always

A typical item in the Mohrman et al. format read as follows:

> How frequently do you actually participate in the decision (of hiring new professional personnel)?
>
> Never . . . . (5-point scale) . . . . Always
>
> How frequently do you think you should participate in the decision (of hiring new professional personnel)?
>
> Never . . . . (5-point scale) . . . . Always

If decisional participation is more than unidimensional and the dimensions are somewhat independent, then the measurement of only the frequency dimension provides an incomplete, if not faulty, picture of

decisional participation. One would expect the frequency measure alone to have little predictive power.

Methodologically, each of the four studies would have profited from a criterion variable that offered greater conceptual clarity. This problem arose as a direct consequence of forming an overall discrepancy or participation measure by summing the responses to the 11 individual decisional issues. This problem is known as arithmetic cancellation, or more generally, a problem of aggregation. It is entirely possible for two respondents to have strikingly different profiles across the set of issues yet receive the same summed score. For example, an individual scoring high on half the items and low on the other half would receive the same summated scale score as one who scored at the mid-range on all the items. Along with their different decisional profiles, these individuals might well exhibit different levels of job satisfaction, but the use of a summated scale score for the participation variable would obscure this relationship.

The results of the Mohrman et al. study indicate that the decisional participation scale is not internally consistent. The authors demonstrate that systematically different levels of response are related to different issues within the participation instrument and that certain clusters of issues are differentially related to various organizational outcomes.

Given this argument and the findings of Mohrman et al., the problem of aggregation must be avoided to accurately assess the

relationship between decisional participation and organizational outcomes. The most direct way to solve the problem is to avoid use of a summated measure, relying instead on an analytical procedure which retains the profile of an individual's responses. One appropriate analytical procedure is multiple linear regression. However, while the use of multiple linear regression might eradicate one problem, it creates another. The underlying assumption of linear regression conflicts with the curvilinear hypothesis tested and tentatively supported by Conway.

## Purposes of This Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between the decisional participation and job satisfaction of secondary school teachers. More specifically, the purpose was to: (a) test the utility of the Alutto-Belasco argument that an individual's desire for increased participation mediates the relationship between decisional participation and job satisfaction; (b) test the validity of the commonly used "summed" scoring procedure for measuring decisional participation; and (c) investigate the value of defining decisional participation in terms of frequency and extent of involvement. To this end, three basic research foci are defined:

1. The summated measures of participation will explain less of the variance in job satisfaction than will the non-summed (or profile) measures.

2. The frequency and extent of participation, in combination, will explain more of the variance in job satisfaction than will either measure taken singly.

3. The discrepancy measure of participation (in terms of frequency, extent, or a combination of both) will explain more of the variance in job satisfaction than will the actual level of participation.

## Procedures

To facilitate comparisons across studies, the present investigation was conducted similarly to those which preceded it. In particular, the present study replicates the work of Conway: the study adhered to Conway's sampling plan, instrumentation format, and set of decisional issues.

### The Sample

Cluster sampling was used to select potential respondents. The initial sampling frame consisted of all public high schools in the state of Illinois. Eleven schools were drawn at random; schools having fewer than 20 full-time faculty members were not admitted to the sample. Twenty teachers were then drawn at random from each of the 11 high schools. The principals of the 11 schools coordinated

the delivery and receipt of the instrument packages. An unmarked envelope was provided to each teacher to ensure anonymity. The final sample included 220 teachers. Of these, 155 teachers completed and returned the instrument. The response rate was 70.5% and all 11 schools were represented. The only difference between the sampling plans of the two studies was that Conway's schools were not selected from a larger set of schools.

Of the 155 respondents, 81 (52.3%) were male, 73 (47.1%) were female, and one teacher declined to specify his or her sex. Over 40% of the respondents had been teaching for 11 or more years, only 16% for less than 5 years. Roughly one-quarter of the 155 teachers had spent at least the last 11 years as a teacher in their present school of employ and almost one-third were employed in their present school less than 5 years (see Table 2).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction was defined in accordance with the use of this term established by March and Simon (1958). That is, job satisfaction was defined as a lack of willingness to leave one's current post. Although related to other definitions of the term, this definition is distinct from those which typically focus upon a worker's satisfaction with various job facets such as working conditions, pay, or probability of advancement. The concept of job satisfaction was operationalized through the use of a five item,

Table 2

Description of Respondents

(N = 155)

| Category | N | Percent of total |
|---|---|---|
| A. Sex | | |
| Males | 81 | 52.3 |
| Females | 73 | 47.1 |
| Unspecified | 1 | 0.6 |
| B. Years as a teacher | | |
| Unspecified | 1 | 0.6 |
| 0-1 year | 5 | 1.0 |
| 2-4 years | 20 | 12.9 |
| 5-7 years | 27 | 17.4 |
| 8-10 years | 36 | 23.2 |
| 11-13 years | 18 | 11.6 |
| More than 13 years | 48 | 31.0 |
| C. Years as a teacher in present school of employ | | |
| Unspecified | 1 | 0.6 |
| 0-1 year | 10 | 6.5 |
| 2-4 years | 38 | 24.5 |
| 5-7 years | 26 | 16.8 |
| 8-10 years | 41 | 26.5 |
| 11-13 years | 11 | 7.1 |
| More than 13 years | 28 | 18.1 |

five-point Likert-type scale constructed by Miskel (1979). The scale was composed of the following items:

1. I often think of changing jobs.

2. I am somewhat dissatisfied with my job.

3. As I evaluate my future as an educator, I feel my level of satisfaction will increase.

4. If I came into enough money so that I could live comfortably without working, I would quit my job.

5. Teaching gives me a great deal of personal satisfaction.

Miskel calculated the internal reliability of the scale to be greater than .6 (Cronbach Alpha). The data for the present study generated a connected split halves coefficient of .814.

The five response categories, which ranged from "strongly disagree" through "strongly agree," were weighted from 1 to 5; items number 1, 2, and 4 above were reverse scored. The criterion measure of job satisfaction was computed by summing over all five items, yielding a scale with a potential range from 5 to 25 with higher scores indicating higher job satisfaction. Based on the pilot study ($\underline{N}$ = 14), the scale was found to be relatively stable and internally consistent. The internal consistency of the job satisfaction scale is further buttressed by the data of the present investigation. In this case ($\underline{N}$ = 155), the uncorrected

split halves correlation was observed to be .687 while the individual item total score correlations varied from .635 to .819 (see Table 3).

Although the potential range of the scale was from 5 to 25, the observed range for the present study was 7 to 25. The respondents exhibited a mean level of job satisfaction of 17.45 with a standard deviation of 3.96. The distribution of observed scores is presented in Tables 4 and 5.

Decisional Participation

The decisional participation instrument was structured around the 11 decisional issues identified by Conway (1976) and contained the following stimulus items:

1. Hiring a new faculty member in school or department.
2. Preparation of school or department budgets.
3. Selecting new textbooks.
4. Resolving student academic or personal problems.
5. Determining individual faculty assignments.
6. Resolving a faculty member's grievance.
7. Planning new building facilities.
8. Resolving problems involving community groups.
9. Resolving problems with administrative services.
10. Determining faculty members' salaries.
11. Determining general instructional policy.

Table 3

Internal Consistency of the Job Satisfaction Scale: Inter-item Correlations

| Item | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Scale score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1.00 | | | | | |
| 2 | .673 | 1.00 | | | | |
| 3 | .390 | .296 | 1.00 | | | |
| 4 | .376 | .367 | .371 | 1.00 | | |
| 5 | .510 | .483 | .303 | .443 | 1.00 | |
| Scale score | .819 | .780 | .635 | .710 | .713 | 1.00 |

Note. Table entries are Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients computed over all 155 respondents of the present study.

Table 4

Frequency Distribution of

Job Satisfaction Scores

($\underline{N}$ = 155)

| Score | Frequency |
|---|---|
| 7 | 1 |
| 8 | 2 |
| 9 | 3 |
| 10 | 7 |
| 11 | 2 |
| 12 | 3 |
| 13 | 4 |
| 14 | 10 |
| 15 | 13 |
| 16 | 15 |
| 17 | 12 |
| 18 | 17 |
| 19 | 14 |
| 20 | 9 |
| 21 | 22 |
| 22 | 7 |
| 23 | 9 |
| 24 | 3 |
| 25 | 2 |

Table 5

Frequency Distribution of Responses to the

Job Satisfaction Scale, Item by Item

| Item | Strongly disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Neutral (3) | Agree (4) | Strongly agree (5) | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 14 | 32 | 36 | 48 | 25 | 3.25 | 1.21 |
| 2 | 5 | 48 | 31 | 48 | 23 | 3.23 | 1.14 |
| 3 | 4 | 33 | 33 | 70 | 15 | 3.38 | 1.01 |
| 4 | 13 | 25 | 26 | 63 | 28 | 3.44 | 1.20 |
| 5 | 0 | 9 | 14 | 75 | 57 | 4.16 | .82 |

These issues were derived by Conway from the Alutto-Belasco (1972) Decisional Participation Scale:

> The principals participating in the (Conway) study reviewed the (Alutto-Belasco) set of situations and indicated that there was some redundancy with certain situations and that others might be more appropriate for their teachers. Consequently, one item was added (dealing with administrative services), one eliminated (determining disciplinary policies), and two combined into one item (instructional policy determination and determining instructional methods and techniques).

Similarly, a group of teachers, principals, professors, and students from Illinois and Wisconsin reviewed Conway's set of decisional issues and declared them appropriate for use in the present study. Four questions, representing the dimensions of actual/desired and frequency/extent of decisional participation, were asked with respect to each decisional issue. A representative set of questions is as follows:

1. With what frequency do you actually participate in deciding on hiring a new faculty member in your school or department?

   Always . . . Often . . . Sometimes . . . Never

2. To what frequency would you like to participate in hiring a new faculty member in your school or department?

Always . . . Often . . . Sometimes . . . Never

3. To what extent do you actually participate in hiring a new faculty member in your school or department?

| Make the Decision . . . | Recommend the Decision . . . | Suggest Possible Alternative Decisions . . . | Provide or Gather Information . . . | Not Participate |
|---|---|---|---|---|

4. To what extent would you like to participate in hiring a new faculty member in your school or department?

| Make the Decision . . . | Recommend the Decision . . . | Suggest Possible Alternative Decisions . . . | Provide or Gather Information . . . | Not Participate |
|---|---|---|---|---|

In addition to being asked to indicate the actual/desired and frequency/extent of decisional participation with respect to each of the 11 issues, respondents were asked to rate how important it was to them to participate in decisions concerning that issue. Five response options were provided ranging from "very important" to "unimportant." Respondents were also asked to select three issues of the 11 which they felt were most important in which to participate.

Vroom Index of Psychological Participation (Influence)

In his earlier investigations concerning decisional involvement, Vroom (1973) accepted the definition of participation put forth by French, Israel, and As (1960):

> A process of joint decision making by two or more parties in which the decisions have future effects on those making them. The amount of participation by any individual is the amount of influence he has on the decisions and plans agreed upon.

Vroom further differentiated between what he called "psychological participation," the amount of influence an individual perceives to have on decision making, and "objective participation," the amount of influence the individual actually has on decision making. Vroom operationalized psychological participation (hereafter called "perceived influence") by constructing what has come to be called the Vroom Index. The Vroom Index is composed of four five-point Likert-type questions; the criterion measure is the sum of the four responses which are weighted from 1, representing low participation, to 5, representing high participation. The scale, slightly modified for use in the present study, took the following form:

1. In general, how much say or influence do you have on what goes on in your school? (low/high)

2. Do you feel you can influence the decisions of your principal regarding things about which you are concerned? (definitely no/definitely yes)

3. Does your principal ask your opinion when a problem comes up which involves your work? (definitely no/definitely yes)

4. If you have a suggestion for improving your school in some way, how easy is it for you to get your ideas across to your principal? (very difficult/very easy)

Vroom calculated the test-retest reliability (over a 7-month period for 91 supervisors) to the Vroom Index to be .61. Furthermore, according to Vroom (1973),

> When 14 supervisors who changed either their position or their superior during this period were removed from this group, the reliability coefficient increased to .63. The correlation for the transferrees was .44.

The data from the present study of 155 secondary school teachers were similarly used to assess the internal consistency of the Vroom Index. In this case, the odd-even correlation was found to be .801 while the item-total score correlations ranged from .770 to .883 (see Table 6).

The scale has a potential range from 4 to 20 with higher scores representing higher levels of perceived influence. The observed range of responses in the present study was 4 to 20; the mean response was 13.10 with a standard deviation of 3.90. Response frequencies by item and for the total scale are presented in Tables 7 and 8 respectively.

Table 6

Internal Consistency of the Vroom Index:

Inter-item and Total Score Correlations

($\underline{N}$ = 155)

| Item | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Total score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1.00 | | | | |
| 2 | .627 | 1.00 | | | |
| 3 | .496 | .682 | 1.00 | | |
| 4 | .553 | .670 | .654 | 1.00 | |
| Total score | .770 | .883 | .862 | .852 | 1.00 |

Table 7

Frequency Distribution of Responses

to the Vroom Index, by Item

| Item | Response options | | | | | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| 1 | 24 | 54 | 51 | 23 | 3 | 2.53 | .99 |
| 2 | 10 | 29 | 40 | 51 | 25 | 3.34 | 1.15 |
| 3 | 17 | 17 | 27 | 39 | 55 | 3.63 | 1.35 |
| 4 | 6 | 22 | 37 | 52 | 38 | 3.61 | 1.12 |

Table 8

Frequency Distribution of Responses

to the Vroom Index, Total Scale

| Scale score | Frequency |
|---|---|
| | 2 |
| 5 | 1 |
| 6 | 6 |
| 7 | 6 |
| 8 | 10 |
| 9 | 12 |
| 10 | 3 |
| 11 | 12 |
| 12 | 11 |
| 13 | 14 |
| 14 | 10 |
| 15 | 16 |
| 16 | 17 |
| 17 | 16 |
| 18 | 12 |
| 19 | 4 |
| 20 | 3 |

Scoring Rules

Modified decision condition. In each of the 11 decisional areas, respondents were asked to rate their actual frequency and desired frequency of decisional participation. The same set of four response options (always, often, sometimes, never) was provided for both ratings. The response options were assigned successive values from 1 for "always" to 4 for "never." Each subject's modified decisional condition was computed by subtracting the desired frequency of participation from the actual frequency of participation for each area and then summing over all 11 areas. The modified decisional condition scale thus had a potential range of -33 through +33. Positive scores on the scale would characterize teachers having less frequent participation than desired; negative scores would characterize more frequent participation than desired; a score of zero would characterize teachers participating as frequently as they desired. In terms of the Alutto-Belasco typology, the three clusters of scores correspond to the decisional conditions of deprivation (positive scores), saturation (negative scores), and equilibrium (zero scores). The scoring of the modified decisional condition scale in this study corresponds precisely to the procedure used by Conway except that the weightings of the response options were reversed. This procedure reverses the relationship between the sign of the scale score and the identification of decisional condition in the two studies. As pointed out by Conway, this scoring procedure maintains the

cancelling aspect of the Alutto-Belasco scheme, but allows for differences in degree of deprivation or saturation that may not totally cancel. (See Table 9.)

The observed range of the modified decisional condition scale for the 155 respondents was -4 to 22; the respondents exhibited a mean decisional condition score of 9.52 and a standard deviation of 5.09. The distribution of responses are tabulated in Table 10.

Fitting the teachers' responses into the Alutto-Belasco decisional condition typology showed three teachers in the state of decisional saturation, five in decisional equilibrium, and 147 in decisional deprivation. This distribution is compared to the corresponding distribution obtained by Conway in Table 11. As shown, an overwhelming percentage of teachers in both studies were in a state of decisional deprivation. Whereas in the Conway study a greater percent were decisionally saturated than in a decisional equilibrium, the reverse is true in the present study.

## Findings

The findings of this research will be presented in two sections. First, we will discuss the perceived importance of the 11 decision issues. Second, the findings concerning 12 specific hypotheses will be presented.

Table 9

Perceived Degree of Actual and Desired

Frequencies of Participation, by Decisional Area

($N$ = 155)

| Decisional area | Actual frequency of participation | | Desired frequency of participation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| 1 | 3.49 | .93 | 2.00 | .97 |
| 2 | 2.22 | 1.24 | 1.55 | .79 |
| 3 | 1.57 | .80 | 1.18 | .55 |
| 4 | 2.14 | .82 | 1.83 | .71 |
| 5 | 2.95 | 1.06 | 2.05 | .95 |
| 6 | 3.46 | .67 | 2.66 | .84 |
| 7 | 3.18 | .94 | 1.94 | .93 |
| 8 | 3.63 | .56 | 2.96 | .76 |
| 9 | .366 | .65 | 3.12 | .80 |
| 10 | 3.17 | .95 | 1.89 | 1.02 |
| 11 | 2.66 | .84 | 1.45 | .64 |

Table 10

Frequency Distribution of Modified

Decisional Conditions Scores

| Modified decisional condition score | Frequency |
|---|---|
| - 4 | 1 |
| - 2 | 2 |
| 0 | 5 |
| 2 | 3 |
| 4 | 9 |
| 6 | 26 |
| 8 | 22 |
| 10 | 21 |
| 12 | 21 |
| 14 | 21 |
| 16 | 11 |
| 18 | 5 |
| 20 | 6 |
| 22 | 2 |

Table 11

Distribution of Scores within the Alutto-Belasco

Typology: Modified Decisional Condition

Scoring Procedure

| Decision condition | Davis-Frank (N = 155) | | Conway (N = 166) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | Percentage of N | N | Percentage of N |
| Deprivation | 147 | 94.9 | 144 | 86.7 |
| Equilibrium | 5 | 3.2 | 9 | 5.4 |
| Saturation | 3 | 1.9 | 13 | 7.8 |

Importance of the 11 Decisional Issues

The respondents were asked to rate each of the 11 decisional issues in terms of how important it was to them to participate in decisions about that issue. Five response options were provided ranging from "very important" to "unimportant"; the response options were weighted from 1 to 5 respectively, with low scores attached to very important areas. The mean and standard deviations of this response set taken over all 155 respondents are presented in Table 12.

As shown, the means range from 1.19 (for "selecting new text books for a course in your department or school") through 3.26 (for "resolving problems with administrative services"). Because these figures correspond most closely to the responses "very important" and "somewhat important" respectively, it is quite clear that the respondents differentiated among the items although, on the whole, all were rated as somewhat important.

There was considerable variation among the respondents regarding the relative importance of the issues. This is reflected in the standard deviation figures presented in Table 12 but is perhaps more easily seen in the distribution of ratings within each area (see Table 13). Significant proportions of the respondents selected each of the response options. As the tabulations indicate, the issues are perceived to be of differential importance and this determination is substantially a personal affair.

Table 12

Relative "Importance" of Decisional Issues:

Means and Standard Deviations

(N = 155)

| Decisional issue | Mean[a] | SD | Rank[b] |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2.37 | 1.26 | 8 |
| 2 | 1.73 | .96 | 4 |
| 3 | 1.19 | .57 | 1 |
| 4 | 1.66 | .78 | 2(tie) |
| 5 | 2.21 | 1.10 | 7 |
| 6 | 2.51 | 1.12 | 9 |
| 7 | 2.09 | 1.16 | 6 |
| 8 | 3.00 | 1.10 | 10 |
| 9 | 3.26 | 1.18 | 11 |
| 10 | 1.89 | 1.18 | 5 |
| 11 | 1.66 | .79 | 2(tie) |

[a]Based on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from very important (weighted "1") through unimportant (weighted "5"). Low scores indicate more important areas.

[b]Ranked in accordance with the mean response from "1" (most important) to "11" (least important).

Table 13

Frequency Distribution of Response to the

Importance of the Decisional Issues

(N = 155)

| Decisional issue | Response options | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Blank | Very important | Important | Somewhat important | Somewhat unimportant | Unimportant |
| 1 | 2 | 46 | 41 | 37 | 17 | 12 |
| 2 | 1 | 79 | 48 | 18 | 6 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 127 | 20 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| 4 | 2 | 75 | 52 | 25 | 1 | 0 |
| 5 | 2 | 45 | 50 | 41 | 11 | 6 |
| 6 | 1 | 25 | 60 | 45 | 11 | 13 |
| 7 | 1 | 62 | 39 | 35 | 11 | 7 |
| 8 | 2 | 7 | 44 | 55 | 30 | 17 |
| 9 | 3 | 6 | 33 | 42 | 48 | 23 |
| 10 | 4 | 72 | 40 | 23 | 9 | 7 |
| 11 | 2 | 72 | 63 | 14 | 3 | 1 |

To verify the internal consistency of the importance ratings, respondents were asked to select 3 of the 11 issues which they felt were most important in which to participate. The results of this procedure are recorded in Table 14. As can be seen by comparing Tables 12 and 14, 6 of the 11 issues were ranked identically by both procedures; two more issues ranked within one unit and three issues ranked within two units.

Hypotheses

Twelve specific hypotheses were tested. The hypotheses and findings are discussed below.

$H_1$: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceived degree of decisional involvement and their level of job satisfaction. (Teachers who perceive themselves as having a high degree of decisional involvement will exhibit higher levels of job satisfaction than will those teachers who perceive themselves as having little decisional involvement.)

Respondents identified the frequency with which they actually participated in deciding each of the 11 decisional areas. The four response categories ranged from "always" to "never" and were weighted 1 through 4 respectively. A teachers' perceived degree of decisional involvement was calculated by summing the 11 responses, yielding a

Table 14

The Identification[a] of "Most Important" Issues

| Decisional issue | Frequency of selection | Rank based on frequency of selection[b] |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 39 | 6 |
| 2 | 67 | 3 |
| 3 | 106 | 1 |
| 4 | 58 | 4 |
| 5 | 35 | 7 |
| 6 | 6 | 9 |
| 7 | 23 | 8 |
| 8 | 3 | 10 (tie) |
| 9 | 3 | 10 (tie) |
| 10 | 53 | 5 |
| 11 | 70 | 2 |

[a]Each respondent selected the three issues in which they felt it was most important for them to participate.

[b]The rank of "1" is given to the most frequently selected issue; the rank of "11" to the least frequently selected issue.

scale with a potential range from 0 to 44. High values of the scale signified low levels of perceived decisional involvement. For the 155 respondents, the observed range was 17 through 40 with the mean 32.1 and the standard deviation 4.59. All but five respondents scored in excess of 22, the midpoint score of the potential range. Quite clearly, the respondents as a group did not perceive themselves as participating greatly in the 11 decisional areas.

The hypothesis was tested by calculating the Pearson product-moment correlation between the two scale scores, job satisfaction and perceived degree of decisional involvement. The observation of a significant inverse correlation would support the substantive hypothesis. The observed correlation, -.059, was not statistically significant at even the .10 level. In the sample only about one-third of one percent of job satisfaction variance was predicted by perceived degree of decisional involvement variance. It does not appear that perceived degree of decisional involvement is a useful predictor of job satisfaction among teachers.

$H_2$: There will be no significant relationship between teachers' perceived degree of decisional involvement, when weighted in accordance to the importance of decisional area, and their level of job satisfaction. (Teachers who perceive themselves as having a high

degree of decisional involvement, especially in those areas they identify as important for their participation, will evidence higher levels of job satisfaction than will those who perceive themselves as having lesser degrees of involvement.)

In addition to identifying the frequency with which they actually participated in each of the 11 decisional areas, the respondents were asked to rate how important it was to them to participate in each area. Five response options were provided ranging from "very important" (weighted 1) to "unimportant" (weighted 5). The effect of differential importance among decisional areas was entered into the analysis by multiplying the rated importance of each area by the perceived degree of involvement in that area. The criterion scale was then computed by summing the 11 decisional areas. The scale had a potential range of 11 through 220 and an observed mean and standard deviation of 77.4 and 24.3 respectively.

The observed correlation between the job satisfaction scale and weighted decisional involvement scale was .163 which was not statistically significant. The null hypothesis, therefore, was supported.

$H_3$: There is no significant linear relationship between teachers' decisional discrepancy score (the numerical difference between desired and actual frequencies of participation summed over all 11 decisional areas)

and their level of job satisfaction. (Teachers with a large discrepancy between the frequency with which they would like to participate and the frequency with which they actually do participate will exhibit lower levels of job satisfaction than those whose desired and actual frequencies of participation are less discrepant.)

For each decisional area, the teachers' desired frequency of participation (always = 1; often = 2; sometimes = 3; rarely = 4) was subtracted from their actual frequency of decisional participation (always = 1; often = 2; sometimes = 3; rarely = 4). These discrepancy figures were summed over all 11 decisional areas to yield the criterion measure.

The Pearson product-moment correlation between job satisfaction and the decisional discrepancy score was computed to be -.060. This score is not significant at even the .10 level. Therefore, decisional discrepancy is no better an indicator of job satisfaction than perceived actual frequency of participation.

$H_4$: There is no significant linear relationship between job satisfaction and the decisional discrepancy score when the latter variable is weighted by the perceived importance of each decisional area.

A subject's discrepancy between actual and desired participation within each decisional area was multiplied by the subject's perception

of the importance of involvement in deciding that area. These figures were summed over all 11 decisional areas to yield the criterion measure. The potential range of this scale is -165 to 165; the observed range was -10 to 65 with a mean of 19.33 and a standard deviation of 11.9.

A correlation of .035 was computed between the weighted decisional discrepancy score and job satisfaction. The finding was not significant at the .05 level.

$H_5$: There is no significant difference between the mean levels of job satisfaction shown by those teachers in decisional deprivation, decisional equilibrium, and decisional saturation when categorization into these states takes place with respect to the modified decisional condition. (The job satisfaction of teachers in decisional equilibrium will be greater than those in decisional saturation, which will be greater than those who are decisionally deprived.)

The null hypothesis was tested through a one-way analysis of variance. Findings were not significant at the .05 level.

$H_6$: There is no significant difference between the mean levels of job satisfaction of teachers in decisional deprivation, decisional equilibrium, and decisional saturation when categorization into these states

takes place as a function of the modified decisional condition score when weighted by the perceived importance of each decisional area.

The null hypotheses was tested through a one-way analysis of variance. The results of this statistical procedure also showed no statistical significance.

$H_7$: There is no significant linear relationship between a teacher's perceived level of influence over organizational decision making (as measured by the Vroom Index) and degree of job satisfaction. (Teachers who perceive themselves as having a greater level of decisional influence will exhibit higher levels of job satisfaction than will their counterparts who perceive themselves as having lesser influence.)

This hypothesis was tested by correlation methods: A Pearson product-moment correlation of .160 was calculated between the Vroom Index and the Job-Satisfaction Scale scores of the 155 survey respondents. This correlation attains significance at the .05 level. Moreover, since the correlation coefficient is positive, the null hypothesis is rejected in favor of the substantive hypothesis: a statistically significant direct relationship exists between teachers' perceived level of decisional influence and their degree of job satisfaction.

$H_8$: There is no significant linear relationship between teachers' perceived frequency of decisional participation and their perceived level of decisional influence. (Teachers who see themselves as being more frequently involved in organizational decision making will also see themselves as having more decisional influence than will their less involved colleagues.)

A teacher's perceived frequency of decisional participation was measured by summing the individual's reported actual frequency of participation in the 11 decisional areas. The Vroom Index was taken as a measure of perceived decisional influence. Due to the weightings applied to the response categories of the perceived frequency of participation scale, an inverse relationship would support the substantive hypothesis.

A Pearson product-moment correlation of -.373, significant at the .05 level, was found. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected in favor of the substantive hypothesis.

No correlation was observed between teachers' desired frequency of decisional participation and their perceived degree of decisional influence.

$H_9$: There is no significant linear relationship between the modified decisional condition score and the Vroom Index. (The greater the discrepancy between

desired and actual frequency of participation, the lower the Vroom Index.)

The computed correlation, significant at the .05 level, was -.280. Thus, the magnitude and direction of the correlation support the substantive hypothesis.

$H_{10}$: There is no significant relationship between the number of decisional areas in which teachers participate and their level of job satisfaction. (Using the Alutto and Belasco scoring procedure, those teachers who perceive themselves as participating in more decisions will exhibit a higher level of job satisfaction than will those teachers who perceive themselves as not so participating.)

A correlation coefficient of only .033, not significant at the .05 level, was observed between the actual frequency of participation scale score (as in Alutto and Belasco) and the job satisfaction scale.

$H_{11}$: There is no significant relationship between the Alutto-Belasco criterion measure and job satisfaction.

A correlation coefficient of .049, not significant at the .05 level, was observed between the summation of discrepancy scores and the job satisfaction scale.

$H_{12}$: There is no significant difference in the levels of job satisfaction of those teachers categorized

in the states of decisional saturation, equilibrium, and deprivation when labeled through application of the Alutto-Belasco scoring procedure.

The Alutto-Belasco scoring procedure categorized 147 of the 155 teachers as being decisionally deprived, 5 as being in decisional equilibrium, and 3 as decisionally saturated. These groups exhibited mean levels of job satisfaction of 17.42, 18.33, and 15.00 respectively. An analysis of variance yielded an F-ratio of 0.95, not significant at the .05 level.

## Results

Research Focus 1: The summated measures of participation will explain less of the variance in job satisfaction than will the non-summated (or profile) measures.

None of the analyses using the summated measures as independent variables produced regression equations significant at the .05 level. On the other hand, with the exception of the analyses dealing solely with the extent of participation (both actual extent and discrepancy of extent), the profile measures were significantly related to job satisfaction. Apparently, the summated measures are afflicted with significant conceptual and mechanical difficulties. As pointed out earlier, these difficulties mask the relationship between decisional participation and job satisfaction.

Research Focus 2: The frequency and extent of participation, in combination, will explain more of the variance in job satisfaction than will either measure taken singly.

The regressions of job satisfaction on the profile measures of actual participation were significant at the .05 level for the actual frequency of participation and the combination of actual frequency and extent. Taken alone, the actual extent of participation was not significantly related to job satisfaction. The combination measure explained 17.9% of the variance in the dependent variable while the actual frequency of participation alone explained only 10.3%. Thus, both dimensions considered simultaneously nearly doubled the explanatory power of either dimension taken singly. Identical results were obtained by the regression analyses wherein the independent variables were the profile measures of discrepancy. In this case, the combination of frequency and extent more than doubled the percentage of variance explained by either measure taken singly (16.8% versus 6.8%).

In conclusion, the data of the study support the utility of defining decisional participation as at least bidimensional, including the frequency and extent of participation.

Research Focus 3: The discrepancy measure of participation will explain more of the variance in job satisfaction than will the actual level of participation.

Job satisfaction was separately regressed on three profile measures of actual decisional participation: the frequency of participation, the extent of participation, and the combination of these two. Similarly, job satisfaction was regressed on each of the corresponding profile measures of discrepancy. Only the regressions involving the extent of participation and its associated discrepancy profile were not significant at the .05 level. For each of the significant regressions, however, the profile measures of actual participation explained a greater proportion of the variance in job satisfaction than did the corresponding discrepancy measures. The discrepancy measures did not radically alter the relationship between decisional participation and job satisfaction. On the other hand, neither did the discrepancy measures improve the prediction of job satisfaction over that observed through the use of measures of actual decisional participation. So the argument of Alutto and Belasco was not upheld in the population we sampled, the scoring procedures we used, and the dependent variable of job satisfaction. Our findings tend to support the conclusion that the level at which subordinates desire to participate in organizational decision making does not mediate the relationship between their actual level of participation and their degree of job satisfaction.

Discussion

A significant positive relationship was observed between the level at which secondary school teachers participate in organizational decision making and their degree of job satisfaction. Because decisional participation is undoubtedly only one of many determinants of job satisfaction, it would be unreasonable to suppose that this variable alone would account for a high proportion of the variance of job satisfaction. Our finding that one can explain 17.9% of the variance in job satisfaction by knowing a subordinate's actual frequency and extent of decisional participation is highly supportive of the general participation hypothesis: increased decisional involvement is positively associated with the attainment of desired organizational outcomes.

While the present study supported the general participation hypotheses, it did not support the Alutto and Belasco argument that this hypothesized relationship was mediated by the level at which subordinates desire to participate. The perceived actual level of subordinate participation was found to be at least as good a predictor of job satisfaction as was the discrepancy measure, advocated by Alutto and Belasco, which was derived from the difference between actual and desired levels of decisional participation. Since the Alutto and Belasco argument is so logically persuasive, its lack of support was somewhat startling and demands further consideration.

There are several possible explanations for the findings of the present study other than the complete refutation of the Alutto and Belasco theory.

First, of course, our negative findings are limited to the population sampled. While the sampling procedures seem adequate to generalize to the target population, the secondary school teachers who responded to the present survey did not cover the full range of decisional conditions hypothesized to exist by Alutto and Belasco. Hardly any teachers were in the state which Alutto and Belasco termed decisional saturation. While the respondents differed in the degree to which they desired to participate, few actually participated--on any of the decisional issues--in excess of this amount. Possibly the Alutto and Belasco argument would be supported when the range of the discrepancy variable was greater than in the present study.

Second, the findings of the current investigation cannot be generalized to organizational outcomes other than job satisfaction. A host of organizationally desired variables exist, and Alutto and Belasco did not direct their argument to any one in particular. In fact, their writings never even specifically mention job satisfaction. Possibly their argument carries more weight with respect to other outcomes, in particular those not closely connected to job satisfaction. However, this is no reason for eliminating job satisfaction from further study. There are obviously many definitions of job

satisfaction and many ways of operationalizing each definition. The present study investigated only one. Various facets of job satisfaction (including satisfaction with pay, co-workers, supervision, and the like) were not studied nor were such more complex concepts such as Herzberg's intrinsic and extrinsic dichotomy.

Third, it is possible that the Alutto-Belasco argument would be sustained if other measurement or scoring procedures were utilized. Because the findings of the present study indicate a problem with using summated measures to operationalize decisional discrepancy, it may well be that the Alutto-Belasco argument cannot be demonstrated by merely subtracting Likert-type responses to self-reported scales of actual and desired levels of decisional participation. As in preceding studies, our data are totally perceptual and subjective in nature. Such data are always subject to the possibility that the responses to the study do not mirror reality. For example, if the teachers exhibited a strong desire to participate in organizational decision making because they thought it a socially acceptable response, the resulting data might not present a fair test of the Alutto-Belasco theory. Similarly, several scholars since French, Israel, and As (1966) have warned researchers to differentiate between actual (or observed) participation and psychological participation. Psychological participation is the amount of influence which subordinates perceive themselves as having.

Psychological participation may or may not have any relation to the actual influence owned by a subordinate, which can only be assessed by the observations of a third and neutral party. Although logic would dictate otherwise, perhaps the Alutto-Belasco argument pertains only to observed participation.

In any case, it is abundantly evident that the present investigation did not fully resolve the validity of the Alutto and Belasco concept. As is often the case, the study raises more questions than it has answered.

Potentially most significant, however, is the empirical support given by the study to defining decisional participation as at least bidimensional. The increase in predictive power which was observed when both the frequency and extent of participation were considered, as opposed to the power of either taken singly, has great import both for future research and administrative action. Of course, the evidence presented for bidimensionality, which supports the notions of several theoreticians, calls into question the findings of any prior studies which used a unidimensional definition. Moreover, it must stimulate further exploration of yet other dimensions. Bridges (1967), for example, speaks of the potential effect of different constitutional arrangements specifying the procedures by which a small group will arrive at a decision: parliamentary, democratic-centralist, or participant determining. Some work has already been

conducted to demonstrate the utility of this concept. But how does it relate to the other dimensions of decisional participation? Does it have any effect? Does it mediate the dimensions? Or is it a separate dimension in its own right?

References

Alutto, J. A., & Belasco, J. A. A typology for participation in organizational decision making. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1972, 17, 117-125.

Best, J. K. Decisional status and teacher morale: A study of the relationship between decisional condition/decisional deviation and teacher morale. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1973.

Bridges, E. M. A model for shared decision making in the school principalship. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1967, 3(1), 51-61.

Conway, J. A. Test of linearity between teachers' participation in decision making and their perceptions of their schools as organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1976, 21, 130-139.

French, J. R. P., Israel, J., & As, D. An experiment on participation in a Norwegian factory: Interpersonal dimensions of decision making. Human Relations, February 1960, 13(1), 3-20.

March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Miskel, C., DeFrain, J., & Wilcox, K. Expectancy work motivation, central life interests, voluntarism, organizational situation, job satisfaction, and perceived teaching performance. Paper

presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1979.

Mohrman, A. M., Jr., Cooke, R. A., & Mohrman, S. A. Participation in decision making: A multi-dimensional perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1978, 14(1), 13-29.

Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. Leadership and decision making. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1973.

# Center Planning and Policy Committee

Richard A. Rossmiller
Wayne Otto
Center Co-Directors

Dale D. Johnson
Area Chairperson
Studies in Language:
Reading and Communication

Marvin J. Fruth
Area Chairperson
Studies in Implementation
of Individualized Schooling

Penelope L. Peterson
Area Chairperson
Studies of Instructional Programming
for the Individual Student

James M. Lipham
Area Chairperson
Studies of Administration and
Organization for Instruction

Thomas A. Romberg
Area Chairperson
Studies in Mathematics and Evaluation
of Practices in Individualized Schooling

# Associated Faculty

Vernon L. Allen
Professor
Psychology

B. Dean Bowles
Professor
Educational Administration

Thomas P. Carpenter
Associate Professor
Curriculum and Instruction

W. Patrick Dickson
Assistant Professor
Child and Family Studies

Lloyd E. Frohreich
Associate Professor
Educational Administration

Marvin J. Fruth
Professor
Educational Administration

Dale D. Johnson
Professor
Curriculum and Instruction

Herbert J. Klausmeier
V.A.C. Henmon Professor
Educational Psychology

Joel R. Levin
Professor
Educational Psychology

James M. Lipham
Professor
Educational Administration

Dominic W. Massaro
Professor
Psychology

Donald M. McIsaac
Professor
Educational Administration

Wayne Otto
Professor
Curriculum and Instruction

Penelope L. Peterson
Assistant Professor
Educational Psychology

Thomas S. Popkewitz
Professor
Curriculum and Instruction

Gary G. Price
Assistant Professor
Curriculum and Instruction

W. Charles Read
Professor
English and Linguistics

Thomas A. Romberg
Professor
Curriculum and Instruction

Richard A. Rossmiller
Professor
Educational Administration

Peter A. Schreiber
Associate Professor
English and Linguistics

B. Robert Tabachnick
Professor
Curriculum and Instruction

Gary G. Wehlage
Professor
Curriculum and Instruction

Louise Cherry Wilkinson
Associate Professor
Educational Psychology

Steven R. Yussen
Professor
Educational Psychology

11/79



BEST COPY AVAILABLE